

REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of June 25, 2008 is gratefully acknowledged.

The abstract has been objected to because it is not introduced by a sentence, and because it is not clear because of the ‘number of deletions.’ In reply, a new abstract has been submitted from which the deletions have been removed and in which a complete opening sentence is included. This new abstract should suffice to overcome the noted objection.

Claim 18 is objected to because of the typographical error resulting in the misspelling of the word “two.” In reply, the term “tow” has been changed to “two.” This amendment to claim 18 should overcome the noted objection.

Claims 12 - 22 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as indefinite because of the passage found in lines 5 - 7 and the passage found in lines 11 - 12 of claim 12. The examiner suggested appropriate amendments to these passages. The examiner’s suggestions have been considered and adopted. Accordingly, claim 12 has been amended to include both examiner suggestions, thereby overcoming this rejection.

Claims 12 - 16 and 20 - 22 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Umezawa et al in view of Pfeiffer; claims 17 and 19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Umezawa et al in view of Pfeiffer and Getman et al; and claim 18 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Umezawa et al in view of Pfeiffer and Dual et al.

The references of record have been carefully studied and it is applicants’ view that none of the references teach a design where the relationship of the resonant frequency of the tube and that of the internal oscillator is such that the resonant frequency of the tube is smaller than that of the internal oscillator so that any effect by

U.S. Patent Application 10/554,199

the tube on the mechanically oscillatable unit is negligible. Accordingly, claim 12 has been amended accordingly to recite this structural relationship. See page 9, lines 18 - 23 of the specification which describes this feature of the invention. Hence, the oscillation frequency of the mechanically oscillatable unit is foremost dependent on the internal oscillator and less on the tube. This feature enhances the effect of the groove/neck on the oscillation frequency of the mechanically oscillatable unit.

None of the references of record mention such a structural relationship so that claims 12 - 22 should be allowed.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested and claims 12 - 22 found allowable.

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

Date: October 29, 2008



Felix A. D'Ambrosio
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number 25,721

Customer Number *23364*
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

S:\Producer\fjd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\LOPA3007-EH0615\Response - October 29, 2008.wpd